



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The more you increase the field of your researches, the more you multiply your productions, the more impossible does it become to condense them in a summary of a few pages. Owing to your persevering efforts, the Society is still in the ascendant. The impulse it has given to anthropological study is increasing from day to day; the movement of our Society is propagated in all parts of the world. It is sufficient to look back at your starting point to see with a legitimate satisfaction the progress you have made within less than eight years. What you have accomplished within so short a time is a sure guarantee for your future works.

---

### WHAT IS A TEUTON?

---

QUESTIONS of race are, in more senses than one, political questions. It is for this reason that they seldom meet with a calm and unprejudiced discussion; it is for this reason that they continually incur the greatest of all scientific perils.

Two great peoples, speaking a language called Teutonic, made war not long ago upon a third very little people, who also speak a language called Teutonic: and the quarrel was greatly embittered because the governors of the third people wished to make a small section of the governed speak a kind of Teutonic different from the Teutonic spoken by the other two peoples. Some of "The German race" were oppressed because their children were being taught Danish instead of a dialect of German. There was an "oppressed nationality," the meaning of which, when analysed, is almost invariably found to be a language in danger.

There was a time when every one sympathised with the Italian-speaking people of Lombardy and Venetia, because they were ruled by German-speaking governors. If they spoke Italian, said every one, they ought to have an Italian government—a government of their own "race." None paused to inquire whether the new government would probably be better than the old; whether the Lombards were more nearly akin to the Sardinians or to the Austrians; whether race could be established by language. It was assumed, as a self-evident proposition, that race and language must be co-extensive; races were divided into Latin and non-Latin according to language alone; and a great emperor and a great people went to war for an idea.

The same appeal to language has long embittered the Poles against the Russians, and draws perennial sympathy from philanthropists

who have never taken the trouble to inquire in what Polish differs from Russian, or what constitutes a real difference of race.

But, more wonderful still, men speaking Italian clamoured persistently for the union under one government of all who shared their tongue, until at last they persuaded the men who speak German to attempt a double suicide. Prussia took arms against Austria in order that the speakers of German might be expelled from Italy; Austria took arms against Prussia in order that the speakers of German might not be too united or too strong in the North. And mighty battles were fought, and the rivers of Bohemia were choked with corpses, and widows wept, and children were left fatherless, because a few statesmen in Germany and a few other statesmen in Italy preached faith in language as the only proof of kinship.

Word-worship in every form is injurious: it has taught many a man a kind of unconscious hypocrisy in morals; it has wasted many a metaphysician's whole existence; but it has produced nothing so terrible as this wholesale slaughter for an idea—and an idea that is often utterly false.

This belief in language as the great bond of brotherhood has been taught by almost every philologist except Mr. Max Müller.\* Its diffusion is best proved by the horrors which have attended it. Its falsity may be shown by one very simple instance. Suppose the insurrection of negroes in Jamaica to have been successful, and all the whites in the island to have been put to death, there would have remained a race speaking English, yet with hardly a trace of English blood; and the philologist of a future generation would, from his own science alone, have had not the slightest clue to the origin of this English-speaking people. Nay, a philological diplomatist might, at some time, have besought Englishmen to fight on behalf of black brethren whose kinship would have been apparent in their tongues if not in their faces.

But although our foremost philologist has given up the classification of races according to language, there still remains a proposition asserted by him, and by almost all the leading writers on language, which, if true, would by itself be enough to prove that grammar is the most infallible test of race. This proposition is that no mixed grammar ever has existed, or ever can exist. Languages have been divided

\* There is not one of Mr. Max Müller's clear and brilliant sentences that is better worth remembering than this:—"The science of language and the science of ethnology have both suffered most seriously from being mixed up together." It is strange that the disciples of this master seem willing to accept every doctrine of his but this most important of all. Mr. Cox did no small service to anthropology when, in No. 34 of the *Fortnightly Review*, he called attention to the fact, that the leading philologist has finally abandoned the ethnological field.

into classes according to their grammars ; and between each of these classes and every other, we are told, there is a great gulf fixed, across which no fragment of grammar can pass. A vocabulary may be as mongrel as you please, but grammar is always of the purest strain.

If this theory were true, it would embody the most astounding of all mental phenomena. It would prove an admitted law of association to be false. We could no longer assert that the human mind has the power of applying like contrivances to like cases, but only that it has such a power in all matters with which it can deal, except grammar. In other words, we should have to admit either that the one great thing which Psychology is supposed to have done has never been done at all, or that grammar is something stronger than one of the laws of the mind. We should have to admit not only that, when any language has its volume doubled by the addition of words from another language, it must give up all its grammar or none, but that the men who speak the combined language can never select and combine the grammatical devices of the two component parts. We should have to admit that grammar reduces men to a state of the most humiliating subjection, so that they are utterly incapable of doing any thing for themselves.

Now if all these propositions were established, there would be an unanswerable argument for the classification of races according to language. An appeal to differences of mental characteristics would be quashed at once by the proof that grammar can mould the mind to its own sweet will ; and no one would dare to speak of physical characteristics in the face of a Grammatical Destiny. The grammar which could make the mind could make the man, or, if it pleased, the race.

He, therefore, who asks what is a Teuton ? asks a question which cannot be answered without reference to the great philological dogma. On the answer to this question depend the answers to questions of still greater magnitude. What are the principles of Anthropological classification ? and are there any real differences between the sections of mankind known by different names ?

One of the great families of language is now commonly called the "Aryan." And this family is subdivided into several classes, of which one is commonly called the "Teutonic." The Teutonic class is made to include the various dialects spoken in Scandinavia, Germany, Holland, and England. This class, with the others, we are told, belongs to the great Aryan family, because the science of comparative grammar has traced the grammatical forms of all to a common starting-point. But, in the lapse of time, the grammatical forms of each particular class have undergone development, or changes, of such various kinds that the forms which are characteristic of one class cannot co-

exist in any language with the forms which are characteristic of another class. In short, to use the technical terms of the naturalist, although the origin of species by development and selection is admitted, the existence of hybrids is denied.

In order to test this theory, it is necessary to know what is meant by the "Teutonic class;" it is necessary to have not only a catalogue but a definition, to ascertain what marks out the Teutonic class as distinct from other classes. Now it is obvious that whatever property may be common to all Teutonic languages must be common to any two. If, therefore, it should happen that the comparison of two, or any less number than that which makes up the whole class, will suffice for the purposes of the present investigation, no harm will be done by passing over all the rest. Let us then try to discover what is common to English and High German that is not shared by any members of the non-Teutonic classes of the Aryan family.

Bopp devotes nearly a third of his work on comparative grammar to "the Formation of Words." It may therefore be well to inquire whether the formation of words in English is similar to their formation in High German, as it certainly must be if the "formation of words" belong to the province of grammar, and if no grammar can be hybrid. How then do we form our substantives? There is a word in common use on the Stock Exchange, which would perhaps horrify some comparative grammarians, but which is not the less a portion of our language, and that word is "*backwardation*." A form characteristic of the Italic class of languages is added to a word of German origin in order to make an English substantive. If there be any grammar at work here, it is not only not exclusively Teutonic, but is not even common to all languages of the Teutonic class.\*

And this is no isolated instance. *Bandage*, *settlement*,† *hindrance*, and a host of other words tell the same tale. And, on the other hand, words from an Italic source take in turn a German suffix, as in *Christendom*. The same thing happens with adjectives, so that we have the two forms *wondrous* and *wonderful*; we have *knowable*, *thinkable*, *useful*, *useless*; in short we can form our adjectives according to a German or an Italic model, just as we please, no matter whether the word which we convert came to us from an Italic or a German source. In the formation of verbs we are so independent of German

\* A word imported whole, as for instance, *Illusion*, goes for nothing in the investigation of grammatical forms.

† Bopp notices a solitary instance, in old High German, of this form *ment* in the word *Hliumund*. But the fact that this is a solitary instance, even if the word be not susceptible of wholly different explanation, is certainly not an argument *against* hybrid grammar.

forms that we can even say *Germanise* or *Teutonise* with any Frenchman or any Greek.

It follows from all this, either that grammar may be hybrid so long as it remains Aryan, or that the "formation of words" is not within the province of grammar. It may be well to assume that modern philologists place themselves upon the second horn of the dilemma, give up Bopp's classification, and so define grammar as to exclude the formation of words.

It then becomes necessary to pursue the investigation further, in order to ascertain what is peculiarly Teutonic in the Teutonic class of languages. The formation of the genitive singular in *s* perhaps? This has been often enough asserted, and the answer can be best given in the words of Bopp: "In no case do the different members of the Sanscrit family of languages agree so fully as in the genitive singular." And Bopp is here using the word *Sanscrit* in the sense in which the word *Aryan* is now more appropriately used, in accordance with a very convenient hypothesis. To go no further, every one knows that both Latin and Greek have a genitive in *s*. This, then, is not exclusively Teutonic. The only inflexions of English substantives are to be found in the genitive singular, and the plural, and therefore it is perhaps in the plural that the essentially Teutonic mark is to be found. But the ordinary English plural is in *s*, in which it agrees with the Italic and Greek classes, and differs altogether from High German.

The long sought Teutonic mark is then perhaps to be found in the comparison of adjectives. Here, at least, English and High German agree; but it unfortunately happens that the Teutonic class cannot make out an exclusive claim to the comparative *er* or the superlative *est*. If an Englishman says *grand*, *grander*, a Roman said *grandis*, *grandior*; if the English farm-labourer describes his sweat as the "*muckest*" that ever he knew, the Greek would equally describe it as *μέγιστος*.\* There is then nothing in the inflexions either of adjectives or of substantives which can be fixed upon as the peculiar property of a Teutonic language.

It is strange, but there is nothing left us now except pronouns and verbs. And the remaining inflexions of English pronouns do not, as a whole, resemble those of the High German more than those of the Latin language. If we look solely at inflexions, *who* and *whom* are nearer to *qui* and *quem* than to *wer* and *wen*; *he* and *him* remind us

\* I do not, of course, doubt for a moment that our forms of the comparative and superlative, as well as other grammatical forms, can be traced historically to a Teutonic source; but that fact, as will shortly appear, in no way impairs my argument.

more of *ille* and *illum* than of *er* and *ihn*; *me* and *thee* are more like the Latin *me* and *te* than the German *mich* and *dich*.

And as it is a recognised fact that the person-endings of verbs are simply the remains of personal pronouns, it is no matter of surprise that the person-endings of English verbs display nothing exclusively Teutonic. It has been said that the English language, as spoken by any ploughboy, would tell its own history and provide the materials for its own classification. Now an English ploughboy sometimes, but not always, uses *s* as a sign of the third person singular of the indicative present. He is just as likely as not to omit the *s*, and say *he do*, instead of *he does*; he is just as likely as not to put the *s* on to the first person, and say *I does*, instead of *I do*. And *I does*, to say the least of it, looks grammatically much more like *je fais* than like *ich thue*, while *er thut* looks grammatically very much more like *il fait* than like *he do*. But, even when the ploughboy is what we at present consider to be grammatically correct, he does not form the third person as a German forms it. The German uses *t* where the Englishman uses *s*, and if it be answered that *s* is only the representative of the old *eth*, still *eth* itself is not more like the German *t* than it is like the Latin *t*.

In English we have no other person-ending left, except that of the second person singular. This, when written, agrees with the High German form, but it is never heard in common speech, except from the mouths of Quakers, and some inhabitants of remote country districts, who commonly use the form *thee has*. But even if we allow that *thou hast* is still a mode of expression in the English language, it is as like *tu habes* as *he has* is like *er hat*. The forms are all so like that they afford no ground for classifying one language apart from another.

It is not, then, in person-endings of verbs that the characteristic mark of a Teutonic language is to be found. We must therefore look for it in the tenses or the moods. To begin with the past tenses, what is there in High German that corresponds with *I was doing*? Nothing. But there is something which corresponds with *I did*; and as in the form of that tense there is the greatest probability of finding a strictly Teutonic mark, the consideration of it will be, for the moment, deferred. The High German future corresponds with the English only in the use of an auxiliary verb; but the English auxiliary is totally different from the German. The translation of *I shall* or *will do* is *ich werde thun*, not *ich soll* or *will thun*, which would have altogether different meanings. And it is allowed that the French future is formed by the auxiliary verb *avoir*, that *je ferai* is simply *je faire ai*, I have to do. Now *ich soll thun* would in German mean *I have*

to *do* or *I ought to do*, but the expression is never used as a synonym for the future. Our *shall* therefore is really, when analysed, more like the French future than it is like the German. In the placid German *ich werde thun*, *I am becoming to do*, or *I go to do*, there is none of the force which appears in the French *I have to do*, or in the English *I shall*, and still stronger, *I will do*. There seems almost to be doubt implied in *ich werde thun*, while perhaps there is excess of confidence in *je ferai*, and *I shall* or *will do*. In the same way *I shall have done* cannot be considered grammatically more like *ich werde gethan haben* than it is like *j'aurai fait*. Any reason which could be given for assigning the English futures to the Teutonic class, and excluding them from the Italic would, *à fortiori*, suffice to exclude the French futures from the class which embraces the Latin, to which they have no points of resemblance.

So in the mood-marks, *may*, *might*, *would*, *should*, we have nothing in common with High German, in which language the words *möge*, *mochte*, *wollte*, *sollte* are indeed to be found, but are never used as mere auxiliaries. Here, as in the futures, the only points of agreement between the German and English are in the vocabularies, not in the grammatical forms; and the vocabulary of the English language, it is now admitted, is not Teutonic, even to the extent of one third.

If we go on to the participles, we still find nothing peculiarly Teutonic in English. The form *ing* is, in pronunciation, far more like the French *ant* than the German *end*, and the German *end* is in spelling more like the French *ant* than the English *ing*. The form *ed* is like both the Latin *t* and the German *et*, and more like the Spanish *d* than either; but the English *ed* differs from all three in having lost a capacity for further inflexion, which appears in the Latin *t-us* the German *t-er*, and the Spanish *d-o*.

In the auxiliary verbs, which French, German, and English, all use for the passive voice, French agrees with German more nearly than German with English. There are two words signifying *existence*, which run through the Aryan languages; they are represented by the German *seyn*, *bin*, etc., and by the Latin *sum*, *fui*, etc. But where the German uses one of these verbs as an auxiliary, the Englishman seems persistently to take almost every opportunity of using the others. If the German says *ich bin*, the Englishman say *I am*;\* if the German says *sey es*, the Englishman says, *be it*; if the German considers how *es sey*, the Englishman considers how it *may be*; if the German says *ich bin gewesen*, the Englishman says *I have been*. In the use of these verbs the Frenchman is far more like the German; he says, *qu'il soit*, and *j'ai été*; and if *j'étais* looks rather un-German

\* Rustics, however, still often say *I be*.



it must be remembered that the Latin *er-am* is as near to *ich war* as *ich war* is to *I was*.

So far, then, we have failed to discover what is the mark of a Teutonic language, and we must therefore go back to the formation of the perfect active. It is admitted on all hands that the German *te* and the English *ed* simply represent some form of the word *did*. *I walked* is simply *I walk did*, *I worked* is *I work did*. But it is also admitted that this discovery takes us only one stage nearer the true formation of the perfect, because if *I walk did* is the perfect of *I walk*, we still want to know why *did* itself is the perfect of *do*. And here we get back to the original formation of the perfect in the Aryan languages. It was accomplished by the reduplication of the root, which reduplication was commonly accompanied by a modification of the vowel. Thus *I did* is only what is left of *I dodo*, or *I dedo*, or *I dido*, or *I dide*. And in a similar way are those perfects explained which have no trace of the auxiliary *do*, as for instance *rang* from *ring*, *sat* from *sit*, *gave* from *give*. In these cases it is supposed that the original reduplication has merely been lost, while the modification of the vowel has remained. But it happens, unfortunately for our present purpose, that, whether the explanation commonly given is correct or not, those German and English perfects which are not formed by the addition of *did* are no more exclusively Teutonic in their formation than they are Latin, in which language exist the similar forms *cepi*, *tuli*, etc.; and these in turn are well illustrated by such forms as *tutudi*, *cecid*i, etc.

Our Teutonic mark, then, is not an unvarying sign characteristic of all Teutonic perfects, but only a mark which is sometimes present, sometimes absent. If a naturalist were asked, "What distinguishes pigeons from other birds?" and were to answer, "Some of them act as winged messengers," he would give as good an account of pigeons as a philologist can apparently give of the "Teutonic" past tenses. And if the naturalist were further asked, "What distinguishes birds from other vertebrates, and were to answer, "Some of them, called pigeons, act as winged messengers," he would give as good an account of birds as the philologist can apparently give of the "Teutonic" class of languages.

And even in the use of this auxiliary verb *do*, the English language differs enormously from German. A German, it is true, can say *ich machte*, as the Englishman can say *I made*; but he cannot, with the Englishman, say emphatically *I did* make, or *I do* make. *Ich that machen*, or *ich thue machen*, would be not one whit less absurd in German than was in French Voltaire's famous translation of "How do you do?" into *comment faites vous faire*?

It seems, then, that there is no certain mark of a Teutonic language. A philologist might possibly show that the English language has as many forms historically traceable to a Low German as to all other sources. This is doubtful, but it is not the point in question, because the philologist cannot maintain such a proposition without at once admitting the mixture of grammars. If ninety per cent. of the English grammatical forms were traceable to a Teutonic origin, and only ten per cent. to an Italic origin, the non-hybrid theory would be as untenable as though the proportions were reversed, or as though half could be traced to one parent, and half to the other. And a fair estimate would probably show that barely one half of our remaining grammatical forms can be called Teutonic even by pedigree, while that half is not, as we have seen, exclusively Teutonic in form.

A philologist might, also, make an answer which would be practically identical with that which has just been discussed, though not, like that, dependent upon history. He might say that, even if no single mark be characteristic of a Teutonic language exclusively, there is still a certain combination of marks which can be found only in the languages to which he applies that name, though nearly every one of those marks may be individually found elsewhere; but then he would be compelled to take up the same ground in the case of the Italic class, and it would be seen that the combined features which distinguish the Italic class from High German are precisely those which constitute the difference between High German and English. Those features are the formation of the plural in *s*, and what Bopp has called "the formation of words." A classification on the principle of combined features would, therefore, bring English into two classes at once; or, in other words, would amount to a demonstration that a hybrid grammar actually exists.

In the investigation of a subject for which a place has been claimed on a level with the physical sciences, it cannot be wrong to apply a test similar to that by which comparative anatomy is tried every day. When the bone of any known animal is discovered, the anatomist is able to distinguish it from the bones of other animals; he can tell us to what kind of animal the bone belonged. If there really are any well-marked classes of language, philology ought to be able to do as much for us with a fragment of any class, as anatomy can do with a single bone. But let us suppose the following fragment to be dug up some thousands of years hence in the neighbourhood of the ancient Delphi:—

*"Philologist attend; unanswerable facts attest my utterances; languages must be classed according to grammatical forms, which never intermingle, never create confusion in a single class."*

This is a fair statement of the non-hybrid theory; but let us see

how far the words themselves are their own confirmation, and whether a philologist could say at once to what class of languages they belong. *Philologist* is a word more Greek in form than Greek itself ; a Greek would have been content to say simply φιλόλογος. *Attend* is a word belonging to the Italic vocabulary, but shows no inflexions of any kind. *Unanswerable* is a word with two elements belonging to the German and one to the Italic class ; but the Italic portion of the word, if any, is within the province of grammar. *Facts* is a word belonging to the Italic vocabulary, with an inflexion common to many languages, but not found in High German. *Utterances* is a word formed from the Teutonic *utter*, by the addition of an Italic substantival form and an inflexion common to most Aryan languages except High German. It would be tedious to carry the analysis further, but it may be worth while to point out that as *philologist* is more Greek than Greek, so *grammatical* is more Latin than Latin itself ; and yet these two words are, perhaps, more frequently used than any others by the advocates of the non-hybrid theory. And in the whole of the sentence which has just been partly analysed, there is no grammatical form which is exclusively German, while there are four which have no existence in the language called High German, except as parts of imported words.

Although this investigation has incidentally shown the contradictions which vitiate the present classification of languages according to grammatical forms, the immediate object of the inquiry was, it will be remembered, to discover whether the most formidable position of the ethnophilologists could be maintained. It was necessary to know whether the tongue has really shown itself to be, not only an unruly member, but master of the mind, before we could feel any confidence in abandoning the classification of races according to language. And during the attempt to arrive at a conclusion on this point, the "Teutonic" grammar disappeared little by little, until nothing was left but one form of one of the tenses of its verbs. Unless, therefore, the philologist admits a mixture of grammatical forms, he must declare that grammar is limited to one form of a past tense ; and the assertion that grammar cannot be mixed will then amount to no more than the assertion that no form can exist and not exist at the same time. But this doctrine will not in any way embarrass the ethnographer.

Since then it appears that, even if we would allow the typical Teuton to be "one who speaks a Teutonic language," we should still find it impossible to define a Teutonic language itself, we must ask, What is better than language as an index to race ? If we betake ourselves to physical or mental characteristics, a process similar to that which we have just applied to language will lead us into what appears, at first sight, to be a similar difficulty. We shall find that, whatever

marks we fix upon as characteristic of a Teuton, those marks are not possessed by all who are called "Teutons," and are possessed by particular individuals among races bearing other names. But the objection is really no more than a verbal quibble. It is a fact that the Aryan languages have not yet been divided into classes between which there are well-marked grammatical differences; but it is no less a fact that European head-forms have been divided into classes which cannot be mistaken one for the other. Take one class of Aryan languages, and it is impossible to say precisely what distinguishes it from all other classes; but take a class of heads in which the length bears any definite proportion to the breadth, and everything outside the given limits is outside the class. Ethnographers, however, do not pretend that any class of heads is coextensive with any ethnic name; they deal not with names but with facts; and very few of them have ever gone so far as to assert that hybrid races are impossible.

There are two great classes of skulls, the long and the short; and they are distributed over the whole of Europe, but by no means in equal proportions. If the measurements of the heads of a thousand Londoners and of a thousand natives of Berlin or Bremen were taken at random, and placed, thousand by thousand, in the hands of one of our best anthropologists, he could pronounce at once which were the measurements of the English, and which of the Germans; but he would not feel any confidence in giving an opinion on a single skull. There is no doubt that the inhabitants of England have, as a rule, the longest skulls of any European people, except, perhaps, the Highlanders of Scotland, and the inhabitants of some parts of Ireland. The Germans, on the contrary, have, as a rule, skulls remarkable for their shortness; in other words, the majority of the Germans belong to one ethnological class; the majority of the English to the opposite class.

We cannot, perhaps, even now, answer the question, "What is a Teuton?" without excluding from the class natives of Germany, whose ancestors have lived in that country for many generations; but, if *Teutonic* be equivalent to *deutsch*, a *typical* Teuton is one of the short-headed class of mankind. We may not be able to say precisely how far the signification of the word is to be extended; we may not be able to assert that all round-headed people should be called Teutons, nor that all long-headed people should be called Englishmen. But we may at least say that to call an Englishman a Teuton is an abuse of language. Either it is equivalent to saying that no ethnical distinctions are anywhere to be found, in which case the expression "Teutonic race" is utterly meaningless; or it is equivalent to saying that the majority of Germans have been called Teutons by mistake.

One of the chief marks of distinction in all races is, according to the leading anatomists, to be found in the shape of the skull. Professor Huxley\* has gone so far as to class the ancient Phœnicians, and all the ancient long-heads of the Mediterranean coasts, with the long-heads of modern Europe. This is startling to us after all that we have been taught in our youth ; but it is not the less a sound classification, if the number of skulls, or artistic representations, be sufficient to establish the length of the ancient heads. The application of a similar principle to the Germans would probably include in the same class with them the Lapps, the Finns, and perhaps some of the races called Slavonic. Then, of course, would arise the question, How are all these races to be distinguished from the Teutons? This might, perhaps, be done in a variety of ways : by minor differences of physical characteristics ; by differences of mental characteristics ; or simply on the principle of geographical distribution. But there cannot be a doubt that, in all scientific questions, an accurate and universally received nomenclature is of the utmost importance. There is, I believe, no dispute about the fact, that most Germans belong to one of the two grand anatomical divisions of the human family, most Englishmen to the other. But in order that we may settle satisfactorily those questions of race, with which are bound up some of the most interesting and important objects of human enquiry, we ought to have a clear and rigorous definition of terms. I do not presume to say more than that a *typical* Teuton belongs to a well-marked class of human beings ; and I hope those who frequently use the word will come forward and answer, more precisely, the question, What is a Teuton?

L. OWEN PIKE.

---

### KNOX ON THE SAXON RACE.

Those who pride themselves on the unsullied racial purity and invincible character of the Conventional Briton, will receive a severe shock on reading De Foe's *True-blooded Englishman*, or, indeed, on becoming acquainted with the history of England. The British islands have been invaded and conquered so frequently, that their

\* *Prehistoric Remains of Caithness*, p. 130. Professor Huxley attaches less importance to osteological resemblances than to resemblances of skin and hair. But it must be remembered that when we travel back to extreme antiquity, the osteological evidence is all that remains.